

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 5-7, 12 and 25-29 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 8-11 have been cancelled in this Reply. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Interview With The Examiner**

A telephone interview was conducted with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application on October 14, 2008. Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner during the interview.

During the interview with the Examiner, Applicant's representative presented proposed amendments to claim 1 and arguments with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, it is argued that Yokota fails to teach any vent to have a structure that a bottom of the vents is located above a bottom of the rotor cup and a top of the vents is located above a top of the lower blades. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments to claim 1 appear to overcome the rejections in the outstanding Office Action; however, further search and consideration will be necessary.

By this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended as proposed during interview for the Examiner's consideration.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 5-7 and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin, U.S. Patent No. 6,396,177, in view of Kurihara, JP 10-210727, and further in view of Uemura, U.S. Patent No. 6,781,263. Claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Kurihara and Uemura, and further in view of Yokota, U.S. Patent No. 7,078,841. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner's rejections, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "wherein a plurality of upper blades are located above the top of the rotor for discharging external air, which flows into the rotor cup through the cooling-holes formed at the bottom part of the rotor and then passes through the stator, to outside of the rotor cup, and wherein a plurality of vents are located at a lower circumferential surface of the rotor cup, a bottom of the vents is located above a bottom of the rotor cup, and a top of the vents is located above a top of the lower blades such that the air introduced into the inside of the rotor cup through the cooling holes formed at the bottom of the rotor cup collides with the stator and is discharged to outside of the rotor cup without passing through the stator." Support for the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 can be found in FIGs. 4 and 5 and the corresponding description of the specification (e.g., page 20, lines 3-16) as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that

the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Shin, Kurihara and Uemura fail to teach any vents at a lower circumferential surface of the rotor cup. Therefore, Shin, Kurihara and Uemura also fail to teach “a plurality of vents are located at a lower circumferential surface of the rotor cup, a bottom of the vents is located above a bottom of the rotor cup, and a top of the vents is located above a top of the lower blades such that the air introduced into the inside of the rotor cup through the cooling holes formed at the bottom of the rotor cup collides with the stator and is discharged to outside of the rotor cup without passing through the stator” as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner then turned to rely on Yokota’s teachings of through-holes 19 and referred to Yokota’s through-holes 19 as the vents of the claimed invention. As shown in FIG. 2 of Yokota, the through-hole 19 is located at the corner of the flywheel 11 (referred to by the Examiner as the rotor cup). However, Yokota in FIG. 2 discloses that the bottom of the through-hole 19 matches the bottom of the flywheel 11, and therefore is not located above the bottom of the flywheel 11. In addition, the top of the through-hole 19 is located below the top of the fin 16 (seemed to be referred to by the Examiner as the lower blades), not located above the top of the fin 16. Therefore, Yokota also fails to teach “a plurality of vents are located at a lower circumferential surface of the rotor cup, a bottom of the vents is located above a bottom of the rotor cup, and a top of the vents is located above a top of the lower blades such that the air introduced into the inside of the rotor cup through the cooling holes formed at the bottom of the

rotor cup collides with the stator and is discharged to outside of the rotor cup without passing through the stator” as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, none of the utilized references individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 clearly defines over the teachings of the utilized references.

In addition, claims 5-7, 12 and 25-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 5-7, 12 and 25-29 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated:

NOV 04 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

